

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/574,848
Amendment filed August 11, 2009
Reply to OA dated May 18, 2009

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4, 5 and 9-12 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over Kanda. Claim 1 has been amended to recite “a cathode voltage control unit that charges a capacitor by a constant current.” As the Examiner has conceded, Kanda fails to disclose or suggest the same (Action, p. 5, ll. 4-6). Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn from claim 1, and claims 4, 5 and 9-12 which depend therefrom.

Claims 2, 3, 6 and 8 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over Kanda in view of Konuma. Claim 1 now recites “a cathode voltage control unit that charges a capacitor by a constant current.” The Examiner alleged in the Action that “Kunuma [sic.] teaches wherein said cathode voltage control unit charges a memory by a constant current and determines a cathode voltage of each pixel by controlling charging time (col. 3 L18-32, col. 17 line 17-64, [Konuma’s memory is equivalent to applicant’s claimed capacitor])” (Action, p. 5, ll. 7-10). This is incorrect. Konuma’s memory is not equivalent to the claimed capacitor.

Claim 1 as amended recites “**a capacitor**” that is charged by “**constant current**.” In other words, the recited capacitor **stores electrical charges** by constant current. On the other hand, Konuma’s memory stores a “current value”—not the electrical current itself as the Examiner appears to believe (Konuma, col. 3, ll. 17-31). In fact, the specific example of Konuma’s memory disclosed in Konuma is a “frame memory” for storing the current value—a piece of data—to calculate a correction value therefrom (Konuma, col. 8, l. 10; col. 9, ll. 26-39; Fig. 3). Thus, Konuma’s memory is not equivalent to the recited capacitor that stores electrical charges—and certainly is not “a capacitor” which is “charged by a constant current” as claimed. Thus, Konuma fails to disclose or

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. **10/574,848**
Amendment filed August 11, 2009
Reply to OA dated May 18, 2009

suggest the recited capacitor. Since Kanda also fails to disclose or suggest the same (Action, p. 5, ll. 4-6), this rejection should be withdrawn.

Further, the Examiner alleges that “Konuma teaches wherein said charging time of said capacitor is controlled by pulse width” (Action, p. 5, ll. 18-20). As stated above, Konuma’s memory is a memory for storing data, not a “capacitor” for storing charges. Thus, Konuma does not disclose a capacitor that is charged by a constant current, “wherein said charging time of said capacitor is controlled by pulse width” as now recited in claim 1. This provides an additional reason for withdrawing this rejection.

With respect to the Examiner’s argument on page 7 of the Action that Konuma’s memory is a special type of memory that “inherently functions the same as a capacitors to store current value” (Action, p. 7, ll. 3-6), applicants respectfully disagree. Column 3, lines 18-32, and column 17, lines 17-64, of Konuma does not support the Examiner’s proposition that Konuma’s memory is a capacitor. Rather, Konuma’s abstract states that “A current measuring device is connected to the fluorescent voltage supplying device for measuring a current value of the fluorescent voltage supplying device. *A memory connected to the current measuring device receives a measured current value* from the current measuring device and *stores the measured value* from the current measuring device and stores the measured current value” (Emphasis added). Likewise, Konuma repetitively discloses that what is stored is a *measured current value* (Konuma, col. 3, ll. 48-59; col. 5, ll. 2-21; col. 6, ll. 1-6, 43-46; col. 9, ll. 16-20, 27-31; col. 17, l. 50); thus, Konuma’s memory is not charged by the current itself. Thus, the Examiner misunderstood Konuma. Further, even if we were to assume Konuma’s memory were a special type of capacitor, Konuma simply fails to disclose

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. **10/574,848**
Amendment filed August 11, 2009
Reply to OA dated May 18, 2009

or suggest such a capacitor being electrically "charged" by "constant current" by a cathode voltage control unit, the charging time of the capacitor being controlled by pulse width, as now recited in claim 1. Thus, applicants respectfully request the Examiner once again to withdraw this rejection.

In view of the above, applicants respectfully request an early action allowing the pending claims of this application. If, for any reason, the Examiner believes the prosecution of this application may be expedited by a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, the applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

KRATZ, QUINTOS & HANSON, LLP



Mel R. Quintos
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 31,898

MRQ/LC/evb

Atty. Docket No. **060304**
Suite 400
1420 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 659-2930



23850

PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE